- 1		
1	Kieve Law Offices	
2	Loren Kieve (56280) 2655 Steiner Street	
3	San Francisco, California 94115-1141 (415) 364-0060	
	lk@kievelaw.com	
4	Stephen D. Susman (pro hac vice)	
5	SUSMAN GODFREY LLP 1000 Louisiana, Suite 5100	
6	Houston, TX 77002-5096 (713) 651-9366	
7	Fax: (713) 654-6670	
8	ssusman@susmangodfrey.com	
9	Meng Xi (280099) SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.	
10	1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, California 90067	
	(310) 789-3100	
11	mxi@susmangodfrey.com	
12	Counsel for Plaintiff Grouse River Outfitters, Ltd.	
13		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	San Francisco Division	
17	GROUSE RIVER OUTFITTERS, LTD	CASE NO. 16 ON MARTA I D
18	,	CASE NO. 16-CV-02954 LB
19	Plaintiff,	GROUSE RIVER JURY INSTRUCTION CONFERENCE SUBMISSION
20	vs.	
	ORACLE CORP.,	
21	Defendant.	
22		
23		
24	To assist the Court and shorten the jury instruction conference tomorrow, Grouse River Outfitters, Ltd. respectfully submits its position on one outstanding issue and clarification of	
25		
26		
27	others that are no longer in issue.	
28		

## Corporate Knowledge:

The Court's proposed charge on "Corporate Collective Knowledge," Dkt. 299 at 8:10, does not state the law in California. Grouse River is not aware that this charge has ever been given. The charge is taken from language in a decision applying federal securities law and its *sui generis* definition, as determined by the federal courts, of "scienter" under the federal securities laws.

No California court has adopted it, and Oracle Corp. has not been able to provide the Court with a California case, or even a federal case applying California law, to support it.

As Grouse River's brief on proposed jury instructions has shown, Dkt. 240 at 5, the applicable California law is exactly the opposite. Grouse River proposes and requests that the Court provide the jury with either of the two following instructions.

## Alternative A:

Knowledge that a corporation's employee receives or has in mind when acting in the course of his or her employment is in law the knowledge of the corporation, if such knowledge concerns a matter within the scope of the employee's duties.

AUTHORITY: FMC Corp. v. Plaisted & Companies, 61 Cal. App. 4th 1132, 1212, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467, 517 (1998), as modified on denial of reh'g (Mar. 27, 1998), and disapproved of on other grounds by State of California v. Cont'l Ins. Co., 55 Cal. 4th 186, 281 P.3d 1000 (2012); see also United States v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co., No. 14-CR-00175-TEH, 2015 WL 9460313, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2015); Restatement (Third) of Agency § 5.03 (Am. Law Inst. 2006).

## Alternative B:

Knowledge of any NetSuite employee is knowledge of NetSuite. In other words, if a NetSuite employee knew something, then NetSuite is deemed to also have that knowledge.

<u>AUTHORITY</u>: *Sanfran Co. v. Rees Blow Pipe Mfg. Co.*, 168 Cal. App. 2d 191, 205, 335 P.2d 995, 1004 (1959) ("knowledge by any agent of the corporation, whether presently an officer or not, is the knowledge of the corporation").

## 1 Fraudulent Misrepresentation: 2 The parties have not reached agreement on the wording or format of the "chart," so the 3 bracketed language in the Court's proposed alternative instruction, Dkt. 299 at 9, 10. should be omitted. The first of the two instructions, Dkt. 299 at 9, should be given and not the second, id. at 4 5 10. Damages: 6 7 In light of the Court's ruling on Oracle's motion in limine # 10, the "Introduction to Tort 8 Damages – Liability Contested" instruction should be modified to delete the last bullet point – 9 "Grouse River's lost profits." Dkt. 299 at 12. 10 For the same reason, the following instruction – "Lost Profits (Economic Damage)" – 11 should be deleted. Dkt. 299 at 12. 12 (In view of the Court's ruling on Oracle's motion in lmiine # 10, Grouse River assumes 13 that it need not resubmit its previous requested charge on damages to preserve the issue. See Dkt. 14 242 at 101 (Joint Jury Instructions; Grouse River's Requested Instruction No. F-34); Dkt. 242 at 15 17 ("Grouse River Instruction F-34 – Damages.").) 16 Punitive Damages: 17 The Court should give its proposed instruction as framed. Dkt. 299 at 13. 18 Dated: July 11, 2019 Loren Kieve 19 KIEVE LAW OFFICES Stephen D. Susman 20 Meng Xi 21 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P. By: \_\_/*s/ Meng Xi*\_ 22 Meng Xi 23 24 25 26 27 28